



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

interest which now seem so difficult of determination will be gradually solved.

We must reserve further comment until the Conference has concluded its labors.

The Cultivation of Insult.

President Roosevelt has added another to the list of pungent phrases with which he from time to time seeks to emphasize his peculiar views of the nature and dangers of peace, and to support his belief in the omnipotent efficacy of a big navy to maintain peace and to secure for the nation the love, respect and just treatment of other nations. In his speech at Cairo, Ill., on the 3d inst., he used the following language:

"The policy of 'peace with insult' is the very worst policy upon which it is possible to embark, whether for a nation or an individual. This nation is now on terms of the most cordial goodwill with all other nations. Let us make it a prime object of our policy to preserve these conditions. To do so it is necessary on the one hand to mete out a generous justice to all other peoples and show them courtesy and respect, and on the other hand, as we are yet a good way off from the millennium, to keep ourselves in such shape as to make it evident to all men that we desire peace because we think it is just and right, and not from motives of weakness or timidity."

This is only saying, in another form, what the President has said during the past four or five years nearly every time that he has made an important speech. But this time his language is peculiarly unfortunate. "Peace with insult" is a hard phrase for the President of the nation to employ when speaking of our relations with other friendly nations. If the words have, in his mouth, any more than a mere rhetorical significance, they must mean either that in his opinion some nation, or nations, has already been insulting us or is clearly manifesting the disposition to do so at the first favorable opportunity. Else why does he use the pungent phrase in support of his wish for the building up of a big navy, a navy strong enough to parry hostile attacks by "hitting"?

It is an unfortunate way to attempt to preserve the relations of most cordial goodwill with other nations, which the President says truly now exist, to talk of them as if they had no cordial goodwill toward us, but were keeping a keen lookout for a chance to insult us. How far short does this come of being an actual and open insult to them?

One could not, if he tried, find in our history more than one or two instances of anything like insult towards us by a foreign power, and the war into which we fell on one of these occasions is now nearly universally confessed to have been a serious blunder, if not worse. It might have been entirely avoided by a little more patience and self-possession. Much less likely is any nation in the future to offer us anything like an insult. That day has gone by; the nations now universally respect and honor us,

and complain of us only when, in our might, we forget to be just and generous.

The President asks "that the nation, as a whole, show substantially the same qualities that we should expect an honorable man to show in dealing with his fellows." That is the truth, splendidly said. But an honorable man, in dealing with his fellows, is not quick to suspect or resent insult; indeed, he refuses generally to see one at all, and above all he does not go about talking of his neighbors as if he suspected them of continually concocting insults against him and warning them that he is filling his pockets ever fuller and fuller with pocket artillery that he may be ready at any moment to "hit." This is the conduct which is expected of a gentleman even in this day, when, as the President thinks, we are so far from the millennium. This is the conduct therefore, according to the President's own code, which we have a right to expect from a nation which calls itself civilized and Christian.

The argument used by the President at Cairo leads precisely the other way. It should convince everybody that the proper way to promote and maintain terms of cordial goodwill with all other nations is to reduce the navy to the lowest possible minimum, to "mete out a generous justice to all other peoples," to "show them courtesy and respect," to cease to throw out unfounded suspicions of evil intentions on their part, and to declare, to the utmost extent possible, our belief in their goodwill and respect for us.

The policy of the cultivation of insult, by suspecting it, by daring it and uttering sharp warnings against it, "is the very worst policy upon which it is possible to embark whether for a nation or an individual." It is the way of hatred and strife and war; of international division and exclusiveness,—with which the world ought long ago to have done.

The Sixteenth International Peace Congress.

The Sixteenth International Peace Congress, held at Munich from the 9th to the 14th of September, has given, in its own way, another proof of the remarkable rapidity with which the movement for the suppression of war is gaining ground.

The Congress, of which we give elsewhere a more extended account, was, both in numbers and in moral force and enthusiasm, successful beyond expectation. No such meeting had before been held in Southeastern Germany. The number of persons in that region who had come into touch with the movement or who knew anything definite of its character and progress was small. It would not have been surprising, therefore, if the Congress had met with indifference or positive neglect.

Ten years before, the Peace Congress had been held in Hamburg, the commercial metropolis of

Western Germany. But, while the opening session there was large and enthusiastic, the daily sessions were attended by less than fifty persons. The Congress met with only a meagre local response and practically none at all on the part of the nation at large.

It was not so at Munich. Nearly four hundred delegates and others registered, and good audiences followed eagerly, often enthusiastically, the proceedings from session to session. The public meetings were large and enthusiastic, that in the "Kindl Keller" being attended by fully five thousand people, who followed with much interest and sympathy until nearly midnight the strong and outspoken addresses that were made. Both the Bavarian State government and the municipal authorities of Munich gave the Congress a cordial welcome, the city government extending its hospitality in the form of a banquet, which has hardly been surpassed in elaborateness in any of the places which the Congress has visited. At Hamburg in 1897 the Emperor's name was not even mentioned; at Munich a message of homage sent by the Congress to him expressing appreciation of the services of Germany's representatives at The Hague drew from him a telegram of "best thanks." This act of the Kaiser, though short of what many of us would have liked, and short of what he will say next time, was deeply appreciated by the Munich workers and felt to be of the greatest significance for the general peace movement in Germany and throughout the world.

The work of the Congress was made somewhat difficult by the fact that the Hague Conference had not yet finished its labors. It was felt to be inappropriate to repeat the resolutions adopted the two previous years at Milan and Lucerne voicing the wishes of the friends of peace in regard to the chief features of the program of the second Hague Conference. The Congress hit upon the happy expedient of addressing to the president and members of the Hague Conference a letter expressing appreciation of the earnest, conscientious efforts made by them to carry out their instructions and reach practical results for the peace of the nations, and emphasizing some of the important things to which the Congress felt that too little attention had been given at The Hague in comparison with the amount of time consumed in discussing the regulation of war.

The subject-matter of this letter gave rise to a serious discussion, and two days passed before the Committee finally reported a text that could be accepted. There was a disposition on the part of some to indulge in sharp criticism of the proceedings at The Hague as a farce, and to underestimate the great difficulties necessarily confronting the first world assembly, and to depreciate the character of the results already attained. But the prevailing opinion was that, while it was regrettable that so much time had been consumed on the regulation of

war,—still a recognized method of dealing with international controversies,—the representatives of the governments at The Hague had not in any sense trifled with their mission, that important results had already been reached from the point of view of international law, and that still more important ones were in the way of being secured. On these lines, which had the support of the entire American delegation, the letter to The Hague was finally drawn.

The deliberations of the Congress covered a wide range, even wider than in former years, as will be seen from the body of resolutions which we give on another page. The proper field of the peace movement is the whole scope of international relations. Scarcely one of these has been neglected in the annual declarations of the Congress. Many of the resolutions voted this year are repetitions of what previous congresses have said, modified in their form, of course, by the present condition of international relations. But this repetition is a necessary part of the peace propaganda, and will continue to be for many years to come. Many people in various regions as yet know practically nothing of the movement and of the principles and policies which it advocates. The ear of these must be won and their ignorance removed. The voting and revoting of resolutions, therefore, instead of being, as some foolishly charge, a useless and farcical procedure, is of the highest value in the process of the enlightenment and direction of the public mind.

We do not remember to have seen in any European Peace Congress a higher degree of intelligence and of enthusiastic devotion to the cause, or a finer exhibition of the spirit of fairness, good feeling and conciliatoriness, than at Munich. An unusually large number of old and tried workers were present, and the experience and wisdom of these counted for much in the character and conduct of the deliberations. It was reassuring also to see among the participants many new personalities, especially from Germany, whose ability and devotion gave promise of large and effective service hereafter. The discussions were at one or two of the sessions among the most animated and vigorous that we have ever heard in a Congress of peace workers. Personal and even national and racial characteristics came out in full flower. But amid all the excitement and rush of debate the best of good feeling prevailed, and we do not remember to have heard a single bitter or unworthy sentence or even word uttered, even where there was the strongest difference of opinion.

Among the many subjects before the Congress the details of the treatment of which do not belong here, that of "anti-militarism," as it calls itself in France and some other European countries, aroused the greatest feeling. The French delegates and those from Italy and a few other countries felt that it was imperative that the regular peace movement should

publicly condemn and disown the "anti-militarist" propaganda of Mr. Hervé and his followers, who not only denounce all military service but resort in their work to violent abuse of their country and its institutions. Eloquent pleas were made by Mr. Passy and others for this condemnation and disownment. Other leading delegates felt that, as no such violent and abusive "anti-militarism" has appeared in many countries, the question was a local one and ought to be dealt with by the societies in the countries where it exists. A number of prominent delegates felt that the Peace Congress, whose members are all essentially anti-militarist, ought to beware of pronouncing condemnation upon any group of men, as unpatriotic, who are engaged, in however crude and ill-advised a way, in trying to put an end to the monstrous curse of modern militarism. The compromise resolution finally adopted after long debate and reconsideration by committee simply declared the regular peace movement independent of the Hervé movement, and uttered no condemnation of it. Whether even this was wise is at least debatable, and will have to be left to time to determine.

This debate impressed us with the feeling that many of our experienced peace workers have not yet fully realized the radical seriousness of the problem of peace under the present military conditions of the world, and that some of them will have to give up the fear of "going too far" and of being considered "unpatriotic" to a greater degree than they have yet done. Nevertheless it must be said that the purpose of the Peace Congress, of the peace party, to move unitedly in its contest against war, even if somewhat slowly, is a very commendable one, and cannot but in the end produce good fruit. Peace workers can afford least of all men to be divided.

The Congress as a whole, and the revelation of growing German interest in the cause of peace which it brought out, and which has also been manifested so remarkably at The Hague, have given fresh ground for encouragement. We came away from the Congress more deeply convinced than ever that Germany is not intentionally the promoter of war for its own sake, that she is not the firebrand of the world, as some people believe, that neither in Brazil nor elsewhere is she seeking directly to foment strife, that the German people as a whole are essentially a peace-loving people, whatever may be thought of individuals. Her stately and highly developed militarism is, of course, one of the baues of Europe, a perpetual menace to the peace of the world, as many of her own people deeply feel. But in this she is only a sharer in guilt with the rest of the nations, some of which — our own for example — have vastly less pretext for armament, either on land or sea, than she has. When Germany is convinced, as she soon must be, that she no longer has ground to fear her neighbors, that their pretensions of peace are sincere, as

we believe them in the main to be, she will respond heartily, we feel sure, to the appeals for a new order of internationalism, the moving spirit of which will no longer be self-aggrandizement, hatred, fear and distrust, but justice, generous appreciation of others, trust and friendly coöperation.

Notes on the Peace Congress.

Dr. Quidde, president of the Congress, won the universal admiration of the delegates by the ability and fairness with which he presided. The Congress owed its success very largely to the energetic, long-continued labor and wisdom with which he had planned and completed its organization. He had, of course, the active and devoted coöperation of a number of his fellow townsmen, but he was the leading and guiding spirit in it all. It was his influence that secured the sympathy and support of the city government, the Bavarian authorities, and of many prominent citizens. It was no easy task to do this, for to many of these persons the Peace Congress and its work were practically unknown. But his success, a very large and splendid success, is another evidence of what great things a single person may accomplish who thoroughly believes in a cause and throws himself with all his energies into its service. His accomplished wife, speaking, as does Dr. Quidde, nearly all the important languages of Europe, a woman of unusual capacity, fidelity, tact and tireless energy, proved herself in every way his worthy helpmeet.

Dr. Harburger, professor of International Law in the University of Munich, chairman of the Committee on Organization, and Mrs. Harburger, also contributed greatly to the success of the deliberations and the pleasure of the delegates. Professor Harburger has received the Grand Cross of the Legion of Honor for his eminent work in the international field. He presided not only at the opening session, but at the municipal reception banquet; he translated speeches into German, and seemed to be the embodiment of universal goodwill and usefulness. Mrs. Harburger gave an afternoon tea to a number of the delegates, which was greatly enjoyed.

In opening the table-speeches at the reception banquet, Dr. Harburger declared that Munich was peculiarly a city of peace. It was full of the splendid works of peace — art, science, literature, music. It was visited every year by thousands from all the leading countries. This the foreign delegates found to be literally true, and they carried away the most pleasant remembrances of Munich as one of the finest and most cultivated cities of Europe.

The absence of Hodgson Pratt and Elie Ducommun from the Congress was deeply felt by all who had labored with them so many years and had personally known of their devoted and fruitful services. When their death was announced the whole Congress rose and stood for a moment as an expression of homage to their memory.

The American delegation, which consisted of twenty members, held daily morning conferences. They discussed the attitude to be taken by them on important questions before the Congress, and also some aspects of the peace movement in this country. Rev. Frederick